

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 remain present in this application.

The abstract, title, and claim 1 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The abstract stands objected to for certain informalities. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this objection has been addressed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of any objection to the abstract are respectfully requested.

The title stands objected to as not being descriptive. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this objection has been addressed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of any objection to the title are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over OLAH et al., U.S. Patent 6,446,119, in view of AGASSY et al., U.S. Publication 2002/0004819. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to independent claim 1, the Examiner asserts that OLAH et al. teaches an image interception method to provide a document and obtain an image contained in the document (see col. 7, lines 31-36, and Fig. 6, for example). It is respectfully submitted that OLAH et al. teaches a system and method for monitoring computer usage. First of all, the method provided in OLAH et al. does not teach providing a document. The file provided in OLAH et

al. is a profile to record the computer usage (see col. 4, lines 33-35, for example).

Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that OLAH et al. does not teach obtaining an image contained in the document. The technique disclosed in OLAH et al. is screen-based. The intercepted screen data can be stored in several data storage devices (see col. 9, lines 34-37, for example). The technique disclosed in the present invention is to recognize and intercept the images contained in a document. Thus, the technique disclosed in OLAH et al. and those disclosed in the present invention are different.

Furthermore, OLAH et al. does not teach recognizing the image contained in a document. The main goal of OLAH et al. is to record the computer usage, such as screen. Thus, the image recognition technique is not necessary for OLAH et al.

With regard to AGASSY et al., there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of OLAH et al. and AGASSY et al. As discussed in page 10, paragraph 0313, the goal of AGASSY et al. is to recognize data using the TCP/IP protocol. Thus, the recognition focuses on the determination of the IP header location from the TCP header, while the image recognition of the present invention focuses on the determination of the image type or content.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the method of the present application is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art utilized by the

Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 103 rejection are respectfully requested.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Because the additional prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning this document are considered necessary at this time.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Joe McKinney Muncy
Joe McKinney Muncy, #32,334

KM/asc
0941-0408P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment: Abstract of the Disclosure

(Rev. 02/12/2004)